UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,494	06/26/2003	Cornelis K. Van Dok	13768.332	6319

7590 11/30/2007

RICK D. NYDEGGER
WORKMAN, NYDEGGER & SEELEY
1000 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt lake City, UT 84111

EXAMINER	
WIENER, ERIC A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/606,494	VAN DOK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eric A. Wiener	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 September 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17,20,23-40,43 and 45-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17,20,23-40, 43, and 45-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 June 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. *7/26/2007* .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed on 9/7/2007.

This action is made final.

2. Claims 1 – 17, 20, 23 – 40, 43 and 45 – 53 are pending. Claims 18, 19, 21, 22, 41, 42, and 44 have been cancelled. Claims 47 – 53 are new. Claims 1, 17, 29, and 38 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 3, 17, 20, 25, 29, 38, 40, and 43 are the amended claims. Claims 1 – 17, 20, 23 – 40, 43, and 45 – 53 have been rejected by the examiner.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 23 – 25 and 43 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Amended claims 23 and 24 claim dependency from claim 49. This is improper, because claim 49 comes *after* claims 23 and 24. Claim 25 depends on claim 24, and is therefore improper for the same reason as claim 24.

Amended claim 43 claims dependency from claim 52. This is improper, because claim 52 comes *after* claim 43.

Applicant is required to cancel the claims, or amend the claims to place the claims in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claims in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 – 4, 6, 8, 12, 17, 20, 26, 27, 29 – 31, 35, 38 – 40, 45, and 47 – 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkado (US 2001/0047626 A1) in view of Kontny et al. (US 2004/0183829 A1).

As per independent claims 1 and 29, Ohkado discloses *a method of simplifying user interaction with one or more real time communication user interfaces by adapting the one or more user interfaces to the user's activity level in a computer system that supports real-time communication between a user of the computer system and one or more contacts and a computer program product comprising one or more computer readable media carrying computer executable instructions that implement said method, said method comprising acts of:*

- *displaying an intermediate representation of a user interface for real-time communication, the intermediate representation including a text input box and at least a portion of a received real-time message* ([0017], lines 6 – 9);
- *monitoring user interaction with the intermediate representation of the user interface, the user interaction including one or more of the following over a period of time: hovering over the intermediate representation with a pointing*

device and selecting an element in the real time communication interface with the pointing device ([0007], lines 9 – 11 and [0010] – [0011])*; and*

- *performing at least one of:*
  - *determining that the level of user interaction warranted an increased size of the intermediate representation of the user interface and, based on the determination, automatically enlarging the size of the intermediate representation of the user interface to an enlarged representation appropriate for the detected level of interaction, wherein the enlarged representation includes the text input box* ([0010] and [0015], lines 1 – 4)*; and*
  - *determining that the level of interaction warranted a decreased size of the intermediate representation of the user interface and, based on the determination, automatically reducing the size of the intermediate representation of the user interface to a reduced representation appropriate for the decreased level of interaction* ([0011] and [0015], lines 1 – 4).

Ohkado does not explicitly disclose that the determination of the level of user interaction is determined during a period or interval of time.

However, in an analogous art, Kontny discloses *determining a level of user interaction over a period or interval of time* ([0047]), wherein the determined interaction is that of determining if a user is hovering over an object, further wherein in order to determine if a user is hovering, one must determine if said user has placed a mouse or pointer over a specific area and remained in the close vicinity of that specific area *for some period or interval of time*.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the hovering detection feature of Kontny into the invention of Ohkado, because both pertain to chat programs. In addition, Kontny's result of detecting a hovering event generates an increased level of information that provides a user with the ability to instantaneously engage in a collaborative session (Kontny, [0047]). Therefore, due to the disclosure that the object of Ohkado's invention is to display a chat window which is immediately available, without being an obstacle, when a user wants to use the chat window (Ohkado, [0008]), Ohkado's invention would benefit, because Kontny provides the "ability to instantaneously engage in a collaborative session," while also providing another useful means for determining when a user wants to use a chat window. The fact that a user has hovered over an object has been interpreted to mean that the user intends to somehow interact with that object, wherein one possible interaction is the use of a chat collaborative session.

As per independent claims 17 and 38, Ohkado discloses *a method of simplifying user interaction with one or more real time communication user interfaces by adapting the one or more user interfaces to the user's activity level in a computer system that supports real-time communication between a user of the computer system and one or more contacts and a computer program product comprising one or more computer readable media carrying computer executable instructions that implement said method, said method comprising steps for:*

- *monitoring user interaction with an initial representation of a user interface for real-time communication, the user interaction including one or more of the following: hovering over the intermediate representation with a pointing*

device and selecting an element in the real time communication interface with the pointing device ([0007], lines 9 – 11 and [0010] – [0011]);

- *determining a size adjustment based on the monitored level of user interaction with the initial representation of the user interface* ([0010] – [0011]); *and*
- *automatically applying the determined size adjustment to the initial representation of the user interface* ([0015], lines 1 – 4).

Ohkado does not explicitly disclose that the determination of the level of user interaction is determined during a period or interval of time.

However, in an analogous art, Kontny discloses *determining a level of user interaction over a period or interval of time* ([0047]), wherein the determined interaction is that of determining if a user is hovering over an object, further wherein in order to determine if a user is hovering, one must determine if said user has placed a mouse or pointer over a specific area and remained in the close vicinity of that specific area *for some period or interval of time*.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the hovering detection feature of Kontny into the invention of Ohkado for the same reasons as disclosed in the rejection of claims 1 and 29 *supra*.

As per claim 2, and taking into account the rejection of claim 1, Ohkado further discloses that *the reduced representation includes the text input box* ([0017], lines 9 – 11).

As per claim 3, and taking into account the rejection of claim 1, Ohkado further discloses that *the acts of automatically enlarging and reducing the intermediate representation of the user interface occur without an explicit input to reduce or enlarge the intermediate representation* ([0015], lines 1 –4).

As per claim 4, and taking into account the rejection of claim 1, Ohkado further discloses that *the enlarged representation corresponds to a maximized state for the user interface, and wherein the intermediate representation of the user interface corresponds to a minimized state for the user interface* ([0010] – [0011]), wherein the "first size" corresponds to a maximized state and the "second size" corresponds to a minimized state.

As per claim 6, and taking into account the rejection of claim 1, Ohkado further discloses that *the increased level of interaction comprises one or more of hovering over the intermediate representation and clicking a pointing device on the intermediate representation* ([0007], lines 9 – 11).

As per claim 8, and taking into account the rejection of claim 1, Ohkado further discloses that *the intermediate representation of the user interface for real-time communication is displayed within a desktop bar* ([0031] and [0042]).

As per claim 12, and taking into account the rejection of claim 8, Ohkado further discloses that *the desktop bar displays one or more representations of one or more other user interfaces simultaneously with the intermediate representation of the user interface for real-time communication* ([0031]), wherein the fact that the representation can be displayed on a title bar of an object window means that the title bar would also display representations of the other objects, wherein it is inferred that objects may comprise interfaces.

As per claims 20 and 40, and taking into account the rejection of claims 17 and 38, Ohkado further discloses that *the step for automatically applying the determined size adjustment to the initial representation of the user interface based on the monitored level of user interaction*

occurs without an explicit input to reduce or enlarge the initial representation ([0015], lines 1 – 4).

As per claim 26, and taking into account the rejection of claim 17, Ohkado further discloses *an act of displaying the initial representation of the user interface for real-time communication in a desktop bar* ([0031] and [0042]).

As per claim 27, and taking into account the rejection of claim 26, Ohkado further discloses that *the desktop bar also displays one or more representations of one or more other user interfaces* ([0031]), wherein the fact that the representation can be displayed on a title bar of an object window means that the title bar would also display representations of the other objects, wherein it is inferred that objects may comprise interfaces.

As per claim 30, and taking into account the rejection of claim 29, Ohkado further discloses *the act of automatically reducing the intermediate interface occurs without an explicit input to reduce the intermediate representation* ([0015], lines 1 –4).

As per claim 31, and taking into account the rejection of claim 29, Ohkado further discloses that *the intermediate representation of the user interface corresponds to a minimized state for the user interface* ([0010] – [0011]), wherein the "first size" corresponds to a maximized state and the "second size" corresponds to a minimized state.

As per claim 35, and taking into account the rejection of claim 29, Ohkado further discloses that *the increased level of interaction comprises a text entry in the text input box* ([0035], lines 5 – 9).

As per claim 39, and taking into account the rejection of claim 38, Ohkado further discloses *displaying the initial representation of the user interface* ([0008]).

As per claim 45, and taking into account the rejection of claim 38, Ohkado further discloses *displaying the initial representation of the user interface for real-time communication in a desktop bar that also displays one or more representations of one or more other user interfaces* ([0031] and [0042]), wherein the fact that the representation can be displayed on a title bar of an object window means that the title bar would also display representations of the other objects, wherein it is inferred that objects may comprise interfaces.

As per claim 47, and taking into account the rejection of claim 17, Kontny further discloses *automatically adjusting subsequent representations of the user interface according to a periodic interval* ([0047]), wherein the determined interaction is that of determining if a user is hovering over an object, further wherein in order to determine if a user is hovering, one must determine if said user has placed a mouse or pointer over a specific area and remained in the close vicinity of that specific area *for some periodic interval of time*.

As per claims 48 and 51, and taking into account the rejection of claims 17 and 38, Ohkado further discloses that *automatically applying the determined size adjustment to the initial representation of the user interface comprises enlarging at least a portion of the representation of the user interface* ([0010]).

As per claims 49 and 52, and taking into account the rejection of claims 17 and 38, Ohkado further discloses that *automatically applying the determined size adjustment to the initial*

representation of the user interface comprises reducing at least a portion of the representation of the user interface ([0011]).

As per claims 50 and 53, and taking into account the rejection of claims 17 and 38, Ohkado further discloses that *automatically applying the determined size adjustment to the initial representation of the user interface comprises maintaining the current size of at least a portion of the representation of the user interface* (column 17, lines 4 – 11).

6. Claims 5, 24, 32, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkado (US 2001/0047626 A1) and Kontny et al. (US 2004/0183829 A1) in view of Taylor et al. (US 6147773 A).

As per claim 5, Ohkado and Kontny sufficiently disclose the method of claim 1.

Ohkado and Kontny do not explicitly disclose that said method further comprises an act of, upon automatically reducing the intermediate representation to a reduced representation, displaying a message to indicate where the reduced representation is located.

Nevertheless, in an analogous art, Taylor discloses *displaying a message to indicate where a reduced representation is located* (column 8, lines 39 – 45), wherein an indicator to indicate that a window has been reduced to a minimized area is equivalent to a message indicating where the reduced window is located.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate Taylor's teaching into Ohkado's and Kontny's invention to display a message to indicate where the reduced representation is located upon automatically reducing the intermediate representation to a reduced representation. The modification would have been

obvious, because in Ohkado's invention, the fact that the window is automatically reduced without the user implicitly selecting a reduce option would mean that they might not immediately know where that the window has been reduced. Therefore Ohkado would look to Taylor's messaging interface to incorporate Taylor's teaching of indicating such reduction to help solve this problem.

As per claims 24, 32, and 44; and taking into account the rejection of claims 49, 29, and 42; the claims are substantially similar to claim 5 and are therefore rejected on the same grounds as disclosed in the rejection of claim 5.

7. Claims 7, 23, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkado (US 2001/0047626 A1) and Kontny et al. (US 2004/0183829 A1) in view of Flowers et al. (US 2003/0105812 A1).

As per claim 7, taking into account the rejection of claim 1, Ohkado further discloses that *the increased level of interaction comprises typing text in the text input box, and wherein the enlarge representation comprises a send option* ([0035], lines 5 – 9 and [0028], lines 13 – 14).

Ohkado and Kontny do not explicitly disclose that said method further comprises an act of automatically reducing the enlarged representation to the intermediate representation upon selection of the send option.

Nevertheless, in an analogous art, Flowers discloses *automatically reducing a representation upon selection of a send option* ([0137], lines 16 – 18).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to incorporate Flowers's teaching into Ohkado's and Kontny's invention to automatically reduce a representation upon selection of a send option. The modification would have been obvious, because upon sending a message, a user most likely has less use for the window used to send the message and would therefore want the window to not interfere with other windows. Thus, Ohkado would look to Flowers's messaging program and Flowers's teaching of automatically reducing a representation of a messaging window upon selection of a send option to allow for the messaging window to be reduced to a reduced or closed state and thus be out of the way of other windows the user may be using, wherein reducing a window to a reduced representation is an obvious variation of closing it entirely.

As per claims 23 and 43, and taking into account the rejection of claims 49 and 52, the claims are substantially similar to claim 7 and are therefore rejected on the same grounds as disclosed in the rejection of claim 7.

8. Claims 9 – 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkado (US 2001/0047626 A1) and Kontny et al. (US 2004/0183829 A1) in view of Quillen et al. (US 2004/0103156 A1).

As per claim 9, Ohkado and Kontny sufficiently disclose the method of claim 8.

Ohkado and Kontny do not explicitly disclose that the desktop bar also displays a contact representation, the method further comprising an act of, upon dragging and dropping a file object onto the contact representation, displaying a real-time message window that includes the file object and an option to send the file object to a contact associated with the contact representation.

Nevertheless, in an analogous art, Quillen discloses *a desktop bar displaying a contact representation, and upon dragging and dropping a file object onto the contact representation, displaying a real-time message window that includes the file object and an option to send the file object to a contact associated with the contact representation* ([0060] – [0064]).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate Quillen's teaching into Ohkado's and Kontny's invention to display a contact representation on a desktop bar, and upon dragging and dropping a file object onto the contact representation, displaying a real-time message window that includes the file object and an option to send the file object to a contact associated with the contact representation. The modification would have been obvious, because Ohkado's chat program is built to improve typical chat programs such as Microsoft Netmeeting ([0004]), which supports file transfer. Therefore, it would be obvious that Ohkado would want to incorporate relevant improvements in the art of chat programs that support file transfer, and would look to Quillen's teaching as a means for such improvements.

As per claim 10, Ohkado, Kontny, and Quillen sufficiently disclose the method of claim 9. In addition, Quillen further discloses *an act of highlighting the contact representation when one or more real-time messages are received from the contact associated with the contact representation* ([0070]), wherein the contact currently communicating with the user is contextual information that is encompassed by "other contextual information."

As per claim 11, Ohkado, Kontny, and Quillen sufficiently disclose the method of claim 9. In addition, Quillen further discloses that *the contact representation comprises a user-definable icon* ([0080]).

9. Claim 13, 28, 36, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkado (US 2001/0047626 A1) and Kontny et al. (US 2004/0183829 A1) in view of Amro (US 5,699,535).

As per claim 13, Ohkado and Kontny sufficiently disclose the method of claim 12.

Ohkado and Kontny do not explicitly disclose *automatically reducing or enlarging the one or more representations of the one or more other user interfaces when the intermediate representation is automatically enlarged or reduced.*

Nevertheless, in an analogous art, Amro discloses *automatically reducing or enlarging one or more representations of one or more other user interfaces when the size of a current representation is modified* (column 2, lines 27 – 44).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate Amro's teaching into Ohkado's and Kontny's invention to automatically reduce or enlarge the one or more representations of the one or more other user interfaces when the intermediate representation is automatically enlarged or reduced. The modification would be obvious, because there is a need for an enhanced user interface that automatically resizes other interfaces that are not immediately being used so as to allow the user to more easily interact with the current interface (Amro, column 2, lines 19 – 21).

As per claims 28 and 46, and taking into account the rejection of claims 27 and 45, the claims are substantially similar to claim 13 and are therefore rejected on the same grounds as disclosed in the rejection of claim 13.

As per claim 36, taking into account the rejection of claim 29, Ohkado further discloses that *the intermediate representation of the user interface for real-time communication is displayed within a desktop bar, and wherein the desktop bar displays one or more representations of one or more other user interfaces simultaneously with the intermediate representation of the user interface for real-time communication* ([0031] and [0042]), wherein the fact that the representation can be displayed on a title bar of an object window means that the title bar would also display representations of the other objects, wherein it is inferred that objects may comprise interfaces.

Ohkado and Kontny do not explicitly disclose automatically reducing or enlarging the one or more representations of the one or more other user interfaces when the intermediate representation is automatically enlarged or reduced.

Nevertheless, in an analogous art, Amro discloses *automatically reducing or enlarging the one or more representations of the one or more other user interfaces when the intermediate representation is automatically enlarged or reduced* (column 2, lines 27 – 44).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate Amro's teaching into Ohkado's and Kontny's invention for the same reasons as disclosed in the rejection of claim 13.

10. Claims 14 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkado (US 2001/0047626 A1), Kontny et al. (US 2004/0183829 A1), and Amro (US 5,699,535).

As per claim 14, Ohkado, Kontny, and Amro sufficiently disclose the method of claim 13.

Ohkado, Kontny, and Amro do not explicitly disclose that the one or more other user interfaces comprise one or more of a calendar object, a streaming video object, a streaming audio object, and a contact list.

Nevertheless, calendar interfaces, streaming video interfaces, streaming audio interfaces, and contact list interfaces are all well known in the art and thus would be inherently included in the invention of Ohkado, Kontny, and Amro as other possible interfaces that could exist on screen.

As per claim 37, and taking into account the rejection of claim 36, the claim is substantially similar to claim 14 and is therefore rejected on the same grounds as disclosed in the rejection of claim 14.

11. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkado (US 2001/0047626 A1) and Kontny et al. (US 2004/0183829 A1) in view of Brown et al. (US 7,146,573 B2).

As per claim 15, Ohkado and Kontny sufficiently disclose the method of claim 1.

Ohkado and Kontny do not explicitly disclose *that the reduced representation of the user interface for real-time communication comprises a selectable icon.*

Nevertheless, in an analogous art, Brown discloses *a reduced representation of a user interface for real-time communication comprising a selectable icon* (Abstract, lines 8 – 9).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to incorporate Brown's teaching into Ohkado's and Kontny's invention to include *a reduced representation of a user interface for real-time communication comprising a selectable icon*. The modification would be obvious, because both Brown's and Ohkado's inventions pertain to the automatic adjusting of interface representations according to user activity. In addition, a minimized icon is a well-known type of minimized representation of an interface and would therefore be an obvious type of representation for Ohkado to include in his invention.

As per claim 16, Ohkado, Kontny, and Brown sufficiently disclose the method of claim 15. In addition, Ohkado further discloses that *the intermediate representation of the user interface for real-time communication is automatically reduced to the reduced representation, the method further comprising an act of displaying one or more received real-time messages adjacent the reduced representation for at least a predetermined period of time* ([0038] – [0042]), wherein the linkage of an interface in a minimized state to a title bar including other interface representations would adjacently link said interface in a minimized state to other interfaces of the chat program that would most likely comprise other received real-time messages.

12. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkado (US 2001/0047626 A1), Kontny et al. (US 2004/0183829 A1), and Flowers et al. (US 2003/0105812 A1).

As per claim 25, Ohkado, Kontny, and Flowers sufficiently disclose the method of claim 24.

Ohkado, Kontny, and Flowers do not explicitly disclose that the reduced representation comprises a conversation balloon.

Nevertheless, the use of conversation balloons as reduced representations in chat interfaces is well known in the art and would thus be an inherent feature of the invention of Ohkado, Kontny, and Flowers.

13. Claims 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkado (US 2001/0047626 A1), Kontny et al. (US 2004/0183829 A1), and Taylor et al. (US 6,147,773 A) in view of Brown et al. (US 7,146,573 B2).

As per claim 33, Ohkado, Kontny, and Taylor sufficiently disclose the computer program product of claim 32. In addition, Ohkado further discloses *displaying one or more received real-time messages adjacent a selectable icon for at least a predetermined period of time* ([0038] – [0042]), wherein the linkage of an interface in a minimized state to a title bar including other interface representations would adjacently link said interface in a minimized state to other interfaces of the chat program that would most likely comprise other received real-time messages.

Ohkado, Kontny, and Taylor do not explicitly disclose that the reduced representation of the user interface for real-time communication comprises said selectable icon.

Nevertheless, in an analogous art, Brown discloses *a reduced representation of a user interface for real-time communication comprising a selectable icon* (Abstract, lines 8 – 9).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate Brown's teaching into the invention of Ohkado, Kontny, and Taylor to

include *a reduced representation of a user interface for real-time communication comprising a selectable icon.* The modification would be obvious, because both Brown's and Ohkado's inventions pertain to the automatic adjusting of interface representations according to user activity. In addition, a minimized icon is a well-known type of minimized representation of an interface and would therefore be an obvious type of representation for Ohkado to include in his invention.

As per claim 34; Ohkado, Kontny, Taylor, and Brown sufficiently disclose the computer program product of claim 33. In addition, Ohkado further discloses *enlarging the selectable icon representation of the user interface for real-time communication in response to the user interacting with the one or more real-time message displayed adjacent to the selectable icon* ([0010]).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed on 9/7/2007 have been fully considered, but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

15. It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-

33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure. The cited documents represent the general state of the art.

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric A. Wiener whose telephone number is 571-270-1401. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Eric Wiener
Patent Examiner
A.U. 2179

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER